

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/384,585	YAMAZAKI, YOSHIROU	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kimberly A Williams	2626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kimberly A Williams. (3) Hyung Sohn (44,346).  
 (2) Melanie Vida. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 January 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,2,8,9 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Terashita (US 5767983).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*KA Williams*  
**KIMBERLY WILLIAMS**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Sohn emphasized that the present invention keeps historical info of the original image and uses that info later to perform image processing (compensation), while Terashita does not keep historical infor to correct the image. An amendment has been proposed to clarify this feature. It appears to the examiner that the Terashita reference is overcome in view of the claims as amended. However, further consideration of the Terashita reference is needed. If it is determined that Terashita still reads on the claims, the examiner will contact Mr. Sohn prior to submitting a reply .